

opinions, of what would be the cost of obtaining what he might think a sufficiency of water.

But, it is said, the Governor and Council, not the Engineers, were to determine the practicability of the several routes, as well as which was the most northern one of them. It must be recollected, however, that they were to do so upon the reports and estimates of *one, two, three, or perhaps even more* Engineers.

Now our understanding of this was, that the Governor and Council were first to decide the question of practicability, *as regards a due supply of water, upon the reports of the several Engineers*, (not estimates;)—and in case of a difference of opinion among the Engineers on this subject, then to determine which were most entitled to confidence—those who thought there was, or those who thought there was not a sufficiency of water. And *after this*, if the Governor and Council determined that either one or more of the northern routes was practicable *in regard to water*—then, 2d. they would determine upon the several reports and the *estimates* of those Engineers who believed in a sufficiency of water, which was the most northern practicable route *as regards cost*. We say *as regards cost*, for we conceived that the Governor and Council, from their more intimate acquaintance with the resources of the State, might, under the law, differ in opinion from the Engineer on this subject, and might pronounce that the *most northern practicable route*, as regarded *cost and expediency*, which was in position the most southern; such a result, as we have remarked, we conceived might be brought about, arising from the Engineer, with his comparatively limited knowledge of the resources of the State, while rejecting the consideration of absurd projects physically practicable, not having sufficiently narrowed down his views to the true meaning of the word practicability, as conveyed in the law.

We owe an apology for having given our views of the duties of others better qualified, and more competent to determine what they were than ourselves; but we deemed it necessary to say what we have, in order to explain more fully our notions as regarded our own duties.

We have now given our reasons for thinking, that under the law we were not required to survey, locate, and estimate the several northern routes, after having satisfied ourselves from actual examination that there was not a sufficiency of water on their respective summits. Still, it may be said by some, it would have been better to have located a canal along the several routes, even if you were satisfied that it could not be filled with water. But are such persons aware of the time and expense necessary to make an actual location, and an *accurate* estimate of 150 miles of canal? A year in time for field operations, and an expense of \$40,000 would not suffice for the making out of an estimate of such work, (costing at the lowest calculation \$15,000,000) that could with safety be relied on. Two or three months field operations, *and a great deal of guess work*, might turn out an approximate estimate, but it might prove to be at the same time an *under* estimate. If under the circumstances the law required an actual survey, loca-